DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 180 SO 001 746

TITLE	Civic Education in a Crisis Age: An Alternative to Repression and Revolution.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Center for Research and Education in American Liberties.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 70
GRANT	OEG-0-8-080457-3737(085)
NOTE	29p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Behavioral Objectives; Behavioral Science Research; *Citizen Participation; *Civic Belief; *Civics; *Decision Making; Democracy; *Democratic Values; Educational Sociology; High School Students; Junior High School Students; School Role; Schools; Secondary Grades

ABSTRACT

This report describes a 21-month research project, the overall goal of which was to develop behavioral objectives and guidelines for a civics curriculum for the 1970's. The project staff first set out to learn whether secondary school students were concerned with greater participation in institutional decision making, and to consider the implications of student responses to the project goal. Approximately 7,000 junior and senior high school students were given an open ended questionnaire that asked them to describe a dilemma in democracy with which they were personally acquainted. The principal findings of the survey were that a large majority of students feel they are regularly subjected to undemocratic decisions, and that most of these students perceive their schools as essentially undemocratic. Drawing on these results, the project drew up a Manual of Objectives and Guidelines for High School Civic Education. It focuses on democratic decision making as the heart of an appropriate civic education, and sets out ten objectives that define an operating code of democratic citizenship. The manual also provides guidelines that identify ideal points in the educational sequence at which civic competence should be stressed. (A copy of the questionnaire, and lists of objectives and guidelines from the Manual are included in the report.)

ED 063180

An Occasional Paper

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN AMERICAN LIBERTIES

Columbia University and Teachers College

501 West 121st Street
New York, New York 10027

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CIVIC EDUCATION IN A CRISIS AGE: AN ALTERNATIVE TO REPRESSION AND REVOLUTION

Summary of a Research Project to develop Objectives for a New Civic Education Curriculum for American Secondary Schools in the 1970's.

Introduction by Alan F. Westin
Summary prepared by Deann Murphy

September, 1970.

INTRODUCTION

This summary describes a 21-month research project funded by the Bureau of Comprehensive and Vocational Education Research of the United States Office of Education.* The project's overall goal was to develop behavioral objectives and guidelines for a civics curriculum able to prepare students for effective civic participation in the 1970's. Recognizing the basic commitment of American democratic theory and law to the concept of citizen participation, and the increasing demand by individuals for greater participation in society's major social institutions (churches, unions, business, universities, community institutions and government) we set out to learn whether students in secondary schools had similar concerns. We particularly wished to consider the implications of student responses in this area to questions involving curriculum, teacher-student relations, student-administration relations, and the relation of schools to the local community.

The principal investigators were Dr. Alan F. Westin, professor of public law and government at Columbia University and director of the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties of Teachers College; Dr. John P. DeCecco, professor of psychology and education at San Francisco State College; and Dr. Arlene Richards, then associate research director of the project and now Headmistress of the Lorge School in New York City.

---

*The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant No. OEG-0-8-080457-3737(085) with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

The central data-collecting part of the project was a field survey of almost 7,000 junior and senior high school students in the greater New York City and Philadelphia areas. In order to find out how students viewed their schools as institutions in a democratic society, and their perceptions of democratic and undemocratic practices, students were given an open-ended questionnaire that asked them to describe a "dilemma in democracy" with which they were personally acquainted. A dilemma was defined to them as an incident in their own experience in which the person involved (themselves or someone else) had difficulty in deciding "the democratic thing to do," and in which there seemed to be at least two alternative resolutions. By analyzing the questionnaire responses, the project staff would have a picture of democratic expectations by students, and daily operational realities in the schools as the students felt they had experienced them. (A copy of the questionnaire, and more detailed information on its theory, use, and evaluation appear later in this summary.)

The principal findings of the survey are that a large majority of the students feel they are regularly subjected to undemocratic decisions. These are seen as unilateral actions by teachers and administrators that deny fundamental rights of persons to equality, dissent, or due process, and of members of an institution to some meaningful share in its rule-making processes. Students feel that the results of the dilemma situations are bad, and report increased levels of dissatisfaction, tension, frustration, and anger with school as a result of the outcomes. Because they cannot see ways to resolve their dilemmas through the use of alternative means, they register strong feelings of powerlessness. Taken as a whole, the survey finds that a majority of these students perceive their schools to

be essentially undemocratic institutions.

Drawing on the results of this survey, the project drew up a "Manual of Objectives and Guidelines for High School Civic Education," written by Frank Summers. The manual focuses on the "intricacies of democratic decision-making" as the heart of an appropriate civic education. It sets out ten objectives that define an operating code of democratic citizenship, and uses extensive quotations from the student survey responses to show how these principles are involved in the educational and governmental processes of the schools. The Manual then provides what we call "developmental guidelines" which identify ideal points in the educational sequence at which civic competence should be stressed, and the particular skills that ought to be emphasized at these points. A fuller discussion of the Manual appears later in this summary, and copies of it will be available from the Center in late October.

We hope that the implications of this survey and our project will be considered carefully by educators, key civic groups, public officials who shape educational policy, and students themselves. Some observers may have been inclined to brush aside recent secondary school demonstrations and protests as the work of a few radical agitators, or an imitative reflection of college trends. But our survey suggests that the great majority of students in secondary schools--the supposedly "silent majority"--is becoming increasingly frustrated and alienated by school. They do not believe that they receive individual justice or enjoy the right to dissent, or share in critical rule-making that affects their lives.

If this is true, then our schools may be turning out millions of students who are not forming a strong and reasoned allegiance to a democratic political system, because they receive no meaningful experience with

such a democratically-oriented system in their daily lives in school. For them we should remember, public school is the governmental institution which represents the adult society in its most direct and controlling aspect. If we do not teach the viability of democratic modes of conflict-resolution, and win respect for these as just and effective processes, we will lose more and more potential democrats. If we mean to alter this, we had better look with painful attention at what our children are saying about their perceptions of schools, for it is these perceptions, and not our wishful thinking about what schools should or might be, that are fundamental in the citizenship education now taking place in American secondary education.

One answer to the results of our survey might well be that schools are not meant to be democratic institutions, and that young people from 12 to 18 years of age are not yet ready either to participate in making some of the rules of their institutions or to receive rights of citizens in the adult society. Of coourse, schools do deal with young people in the process of forming themselves, and of course we do not expect school decisions and secondary education to be a rigid reproduction of adult political society. Yet recognizing these realities does not mean that schools can ignore the growing insistence on clearer citizen rights and more meaningful participation that have marked our society during the past decade. These demands have been given legitimacy and sanction by many court rulings, legislative acts, governmental programs, and intra-organizational reforms. We believe it is the challenge of civic education in our schools to find ways to conduct learning, teaching, and administration within such a deepened democratic context, and that it is the task of students, teachers,

administrators, parents, and community leaders to create schools for the 1970's in which such experimentation can take place.

Alan F. Westin

Alan F. Westin

DATA GATHERING

The survey aimed to answer such questions as: How do students perceive their schools as a democratic institution? What kinds of democratic problems do the students experience in their everyday lives? How do the students describe these problems? Do their choice of problems and descriptions vary with increasing age?

These questions were investigated by asking the students to describe a dilemma incident in which they were not sure of what "the democratic thing to do" was. The data was obtained from ordinary students, generally while they were attending their social studies classes. Very few of the students were active in political protest groups.

The interview form was developed and pretested with a group of school administrators, teachers and students in the fall of 1968. The basic version, asking for a dilemma in democratic behavior left open the question of whether the student felt he had been successful in resolving the dilemma. The interview stimulus was purposely neutral enough to elicit responses expressing satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the dilemma's resolution. Other versions of the questionnaire were created to test whether responses, which were almost exclusively incidents of non-successful conflict resolution, were the result of the basic form's structure or the product of the respondent's thoughts. One version was designed to elicit incidents in which students perceived themselves as successful while another specifically asked what the person on the other side of the conflict might have said. Both altered versions produced one-sided, generally unsuccessful incidents from respondents. Still another version was written to elicit dilemma situations rather than gripes. To help the respondents include both sides of an incident they were asked to describe an incident on one page and on the next page

to project the position of the person(s) on the other side of the incident. None of these versions produced a change in the types of responses. It was concluded that the wording and format of the basic version were not the factor determining one-sided accounts of incidents.

After writing their dilemma incidents, students were asked to check whether their incidents were complete and to rank their incidents from 1 to 4 along four civic participation codes: Dissent, Equality, Decision-making and Due Process. These four aspects of democratic behavior had been outlined in the original substantive theoretical basis. Students were urged but not compelled to participate.* No identifying data was asked for to assure the students privacy and protection from reprisals. Except in elementary schools where individual interviews were administered, questionnaires were distributed and completed in the classrooms.

A total of 6,783 written interviews largely from 20 secondary schools were gathered in the spring of 1969. The schools participating in the survey did not constitute a random national sample. Except for one high school in Philadelphia, all the participating schools were in the greater New York metropolitan region. To a large extent, they were self-selected, i.e. principals who would allow collection of data, teachers who would give out surveys to their classes independently, etc. In some schools every student completed a questionnaire while in others only a small proportion of the student body participated. While the sample was not random, enough schools of different types (lower class, middle class, urban, suburban, school for gifted students) were surveyed to make the sample representative

*From the 6,783 students interviewed, only 317 (4.6%) refused to answer the interview forms or returned a blank or defaced form. An additional 953 (14.04%) of the questionnaires were eliminated as non-incidents.

of students and schools in other metropolitan areas. The participating students comprised an extensive mix of socio-economic status, race, religion and nationality.

The data gathering team was composed of 27 interviewers between the ages of 19 and 30. Sixteen interviewers were graduate students and 11 were undergraduates. The interviewing team was interracial and included representatives of several nationalities. Their style of dress often included long hair, beards, and other badges of the social protest movement at the time. Rather than hiring professional interviewers, the Center's staff decided that presentation by student interviewers would increase communication with the respondents and the probability of meaningful responses.

Two pre-service training sessions were conducted by the Center staff before any data were gathered. They included a presentation of the Center's theory of participation and the purposes of this research project as well as a video-taped presentation of how to conduct a written interview and films of a social studies class to show typical teacher student behavior. Films of staged incidents to illustrate the participation codes and the dilemmas they present were also shown. The training sessions were characterized by active interchange between interviewers and Center staff.

CODING AND DATA ANALYSIS

The coding system was designed to reduce the interview materials to statistically treatable categories. The data was examined in light of five basic codes: civic participation codes, content codes, psychological process codes, conflict resolution codes and affect codes.

A. Civic Participation Code

The protocols were coded according to four dimensions of "civic

mindedness." These categories (equality, due process, decision-making and dissent) were derived from Dr. Alan Westin's theory of civic participation.

The categories were pretested with a panel of high school students, teachers and administrators. After discussion of the terms decision-making and dissent, the panel was asked to rank taped incidents. This allowed good agreement on the meaning of the terms and indicated that other students would be able to categorize their own incidents in these terms.

Students categorized their own incidents ranking them from 1 to 4, from the most appropriate to the least appropriate category. In analyzing the data the coders were asked to rank the respondents' incidents without looking at the student responses. Students and coders rankings of the categories are similar.

B. Content Code

The content codes identified the substance of the incidents. Unlike the other codes, the content codes were derived empirically from the data. Staff members read replies to the questionnaires until no new substantive categories were derived from reading another hundred questionnaires. The resulting 41 categories were grouped into six major content categories:

1) Issues pertaining to courses and curriculum

2) Political issues which pertained to political units larger than the school

3) Issues involving the infractions of legal codes of units larger than the school

4) Issues involving aspects of school organization other than academic issues (Non-academic School Issues)

5) Out-of-school social issues involving peers and adult society, but not in legal or political contexts

6) Issues of individual rights involving authorities, mainly in school, or involving others outside of school but which became problems because they involved e.g. parental objections to long hair based on school rules against it (Individual Rights).

In data analysis frequencies were tabulated for the six categories. The frequencies were compared and consolidated in School Governance Issues (Non-Academic School Issues and Individual Rights) and Other Issues. School Governance Issues comprised over half of the reported dilemmas.

C. Psychological Process Codes - Interpersonal Involvement

The process codes, developed by Dr. Arlene Richards from theories of child adolescent development were designed to show how the students described the antagonists and protagonists of their incidents along four dimensions. Two of the codes aimed to categorize how the writer described the protagonist of the story in terms of Distance (He and They being more distant than I or We) and Group Size (single person or group). The last two codes categorize how the writer described the story's antagonist in terms of Relative Status (whether antagonist was a peer or authority figure) and Personification (whether antagonist was an individual person or an institution).

Derived from Piaget's and Inhelder's work on Decentering in adolescents, it was hypothesized that more socially mature students would be able to see things from another's point of view and would therefore describe incidents in a more distant fashion, would describe incidents in terms of groups rather than individuals, would discuss incidents with people socially distant from the writer and would be involved in conflicts with institutions rather than with individuals. In order to examine these hypotheses, vital to those interested in civics education curriculum, and to answer such questions as: Does a student's ability to see options go along with personal involvement in a conflict? correlations between codes and within the process code were computed. Chi-square computations are recorded.

D. Alternatives and Convictions Codes

The alternatives and convictions codes created by Professor John DeCecco

flowed from social science theory regarding conflict resolution. They described whether respondents perceived alternative solutions to their dilemmas and if they perceived choices whether conviction or expediency was involved in the protagonists choice of alternatives.

E. Conflict Resolution I: Negotiation versus Decision by Authority

The conflict resolution codes identified the types of resolution processes employed. In order to determine how democracy works in the schools, the investigations aimed to code all theoretical categories of democratic decision-making that one would expect to be used in a democratic dilemma (mediation, negotiation, arbitration). The data were coded for all non-violent means of conflict resolution. However, analysis was carried out only on negotiation and decision-making authority since these were the only categories mentioned often enough to permit analysis.

F. Conflict Resolution II: Use of Force

Force, for coding purposes was defined as any actual use of physical force, restraint or coercion. The use of force category was compiled separately for peers, authorities and subordinates. In analysis, a total use of force category was formed as a composite of the three separate compilations.

G. Affect Code

The affect codes indicated the student's feelings about the outcome of the story. They were developed from basic ideas about an outcome as satisfactory, neutral or dissatisfactory and as tension producing or decreasing. The respondent's judgement of the outcome was categorized as bad, good, mixed or unclear. The frequencies were analyzed as bad v. good, mixed or unclear and good v. bad, mixed or unclear.

Each of the codes was applied to each student incident in the overall study. The codes were also separately compared for individual schools

in the Cross-sectional and Schools with Black Students comparisons, and for students as a group in the Urban-Suburban and the educational level comparisons.

OVERALL RESULTS

The results of the overall analysis looking at the body of students clearly revealed the attitudes of this "silent majority" toward their schools as an undemocratic institution.

1) The students decisively identified decision-making as the most frequent category of civic dilemmas. It was chosen almost 70% of the time as the first or second best dimension of civic participation to describe their dilemmas.

2) The combined content category of school governance (non-academic school issues plus individual rights issues) covered more than half of the problems in democracy raised by the students.

3) Analysis of the psychological process categories showed that most students were concerned with personal rather than distant problems.

4) The sample showed that students wrote about an equal number of incidents involving indiwidual and group protagonists. Political issues were clearly seen in personal and individual terms rather than in group or institutional terms.

5) More than three times the number of dilemmas concerned conflict with authorities rather than conflicts with peers.

6) In the overall sample, about twice as many incidents reported involved conflicts with persons rather than conflicts with institutions.

7) Analysis of the alternative and conviction codes showed that more than 4/5 of the students expressed no alternative solutions to their dilemmas. Only 18.22% of the respondents felt that they had any options; the remainder perceived themselves as relatively powerless. Among the

1/5 who did perceive alternatives to the protagonist actions, the overwhelming majority mentioned convictions as a factor in their choice.

8) The conflict resolution codes demonstrated that the means of conflict resolution in democratic dilemmas was overwhelmingly unilateral decisions by authorities. Only 1/6th of the students mentioned negotiation (loosely defined as "talking things over") as a means of conflict resolution in the incidents.

9) In the overall sample less than 1/5 of the conflict incidents were resolved by use of force. However, of these incidents less than 1/3 involved force among peers and less than 1/6 involved use of force from subordinates (students) directed against authorities. Over half of the incidents involving use of force as the means of conflict resolution was the use of force by authorities toward subordinates.

10) The outcomes of the incidents were largely perceived by their authors as bad. Less than 16% were evaluated as good; approximately the same small number perceived tension levels lowered after the conflict. Dissatisfaction and raised tension levels were the almost universal results following incidents. The dissatisfaction and increased levels of tension are descriptively exemplified by the frustrated and angry feelings of students previously quoted. A large group of students in all schools directed their hostility resulting from a sense of powerlessness and what they considered unfair and arbitrary teacher and principal conduct against the authorities. A smaller group of students are uninvolved and resentful of the disruptive students. They too feel helpless; their antagonisms are peer directed.

The reactions of students interviewed varied with their perceptions. Some students were able to see themselves as decision-making participants in the schools. They were even able to relate these processes in the

school to the democratic rules of the larger community. For example, one student who related an incident in her school to such national concern as constitutional rights to privacy said:

Numerous incidents have taken place in this school which indicate a conflict of interpretation of democracy has taken place. One such incident which has not yet been overemphasized is the student's right to privacy of his locker.

A discussion was held between interested students and the school's new superintendent during which the superintendent said he would not hesitate to search a student's locker if he felt that illegal drugs might be found and confiscated from the locker. He would then immediately inform the police, he said.

The question involved is clear: Does the student have the privacy of his own locker? Two opposing opinions arose from the situation.

The superintendent felt that it is the duty of the school to protect the students (whom he felt might be harmed by the drugs) and to uphold the law illegalizing these drugs. If, in the process of doing so, students' lockers would be searched (without warrant) this was justified he felt. It was not clear whether he felt the constitutional right to privacy did not apply to students, lockers, or cases where drugs were involved.

The students felt, of course, that they like all Americans had the right to privacy of property. This would mean that students' belongings including their lockers (which are temporarily theirs) could not be searched without a court-issued warrant.

In the end (if this is the end) as usual the administration made the final decision and (perhaps contrary to the precedent set by ACLU in court which said students, too, are guaranteed the constitutional rights) lockers may be searched at any time by the higher administrators.

Her statement shows that she not only understands how democracy operates in terms of her immediate school situation but can transfer her knowledge to the larger society.

However, more students saw themselves as participants in their school situations but did not transfer these processes to the larger community.

"The G.O. president nominating (process) is not democratic. In this school, we the students don't nominate a G.O. president.

An appointed nominating committee selects our candidates. I think that is unfair. I feel that the student body should be able to nominate persons for the position instead of having someone do it for us!!!"

The second student feels rebellious because he is being denied the opportunity to participate and he demands a change in the institution which will allow him to participate. However, he does not transfer this knowledge to the larger community.

A third group of students expressed total despair. One such student is convinced of the futility of even trying to change his school.

> In this school many students are starting to feel that what's going on in the school is unfair, such as detention, suspension, the smoking rules, dress code, and many other school policies, personally I don't give a damn. I hate school very much and I am waiting patiently until the day I get out... Starting something such as sending a paper to all students saying strike for what they want is bullshit, because even if everyone felt that way nothing would ever become of anything...

Most of the students sampled in this study gave responses in this third category. They were unable to describe any actions on their part which would have influenced the decisions ultimately arrived at in their schools.

The protocols of these three students represent three points on a continuum. The despairing student does not see the use in participating in his school at all. The second student can identify problems within his school and wants to make changes but needs to learn how he can effect them. The first student is able to define her democratic dilemma within the school and to relate it to the outside world.

The experiences of these three students in their schools are part of their "civic education." Through these experiences each has learned something about participation in the political world of their schools. These concrete learning experiences will deeply affect their attitudes and behaviors as future citizens. In order to create positive citizenship experiences, the school must provide both the atmosphere and guidance for effective participation.

COMPARISON STUDIES

The principal findings of the overall sample were supplemented by a cross-sectional comparison, an urban-suburban comparison and a comparison of schools with black students. In these analyses, data from individual schools were analyzed separately. Chi-square statistics were computed for the comparisons. The schools were selected as representative of particular geographic and socio-economic types. Therefore, schools may find it more useful to look at the suburban-urban or cross-sectional comparisons containing details about similar schools than to use the general sample and attempting to apply it to their specific situations.

Cross-Sectional Comparison

This analysis compared the basic five codes in two urban high schools and their feeder junior high schools and in two suburban junior and senior highs. Among the major results of the cross-sectional comparison was support for the overall conclusions pointing to the predominance of incidents involving decision-making. The finding that an overwhelming proportion of incidents have bad outcomes and increased tension levels was also confirmed. Dissatisfaction was shown to be greater among high school than junior high school students.

The comparison pointed to important developmental patterns. There appeared to be no significant change from junior to senior high students in the agreement between coders and students on civic participation codes or btween frequency of civic participation categories chosen. A developmental pattern was seen through the content codes as students became increasingly more concerned with distant issues. Students at higher school levels were more likely to describe incidents concerning others as well as incidents involving large groups. At higher levels, antagonists were more often perceived as authorities and institutions. In general, both distance

and group size increased with school level.

The alternative conviction codes portrayed a relatively high occurrence of conviction and low occurrence of alternatives at every level. A striking find showed a lack of developmental difference in ability to see alternatives for one's actions. High school students perceived no more alternatives for action than junior high students. There was no systematic difference found in use of force by authorities by school level in either suburban or urban schools. If developmental stages do not determine the use of force in the schools, school governance may be the decisive factor.

Urban-Suburban Comparison

The urban-suburban analysis compared seven suburban high schools and three junior highs with six urban high schools and three junior highs. The sample included schools representing different socio-economic communities.

In sum, the comparison again revealed that decision-making was the most frequently cited civic participation category by both suburban and urban students. Both groups of students saw a lack of alternative choices of conflict resolution in their dilemmas. The two reported limited attempts to resolve conflicts by democratic means (negotiation, mediation, arbitration) and high levels of dissatisfaction with low levels of tension reduction regarding outcomes. The latter suggests that local school factors rather than urban and suburban schools largely determine the extent of satisfaction felt by students. Suburban students mentioned School Governance issues much more often than urban students. They also reported more resolution of conflict via unilateral decision-making by authorities and use of force by authorities. At the same time, more frequent attempts at negotiation were perceived in the suburbs. On the other hand, urban students described more equality and due process incidents, greater problems involving political issues, fewer attempts to resolve conflict by negotiation or decision by

authority and a greater frequency of conflict resolution through total use of force (2/3 of the force from peers and subordinates.) The urban schools appear from the findings to be even less democratic than suburban schools according to our criteria.

Schools with Black Students Comparison

The staff also compared five urban and two suburban high schools with black students against the total sample. In brief, the comparison showed many differences between schools with black students. For example, in the overall sample the percentage of reported incidents resolved by authority decision-making was 55.32% while negotiation was reported only 16.32% of the time. In the seven schools with black students, students in four schools mentioned negotiation less than the overall sample while three reported it more frequently. Similarly, four reported dicision by authority more frequently and three less frequently than the overall sample. Other factors than the attendance of black students--such as the decision making and conflict resolution style of the local school administrator--were more important in describing a school's democratic dilemmas. The category of schools with black students did not reveal any distinguishing characteristics. Differences occurred between individual schools rather than between predominantly black schools and predominantly white schools.

DEVELOPMENTAL PATTERNS

The goal of the total civics education project was to develop a set of behavioral objectives for citizenship education in American secondary schools for the next decade. The concrete goal of objectives necessitated concern for the cognitive developmental patterns that might determine the learning of democratic behaviors at various levels. Because abilities to see alternative choices for action and to see events from other's viewpoints

are skills essential to making democratic decisions, the survey also aimed to measure how these abilities develop mentally. Aspects of Piaget's theory of "Decentering" provided the theoretical conceptualization for several important hypotheses. The aspects of "Decentering" investigated for this study were 1) differentiation of one's own from other's viewpoints, 2) enlargement of one's social horizons. It was hypothesized that older students would:

1) be more likely to describe the protagonists of their incidents in terms of the distant "He" or "They" versus "I" or "We" (Distant Code),

2) be more likey to describe incidents with group rather than individual protagonists (Group Size),

3) be more likely to describe incidents whose antagonists were authority figures rather than peers (Relative Status),

4) be more likely to describe incidents whose antagonists were institutions rather than peer groups (Personification).

These four aspects of interpersonal involvement which were also correlates of maturity were analyzed in the overall comparison, the suburban urban comparison, the cross sectional comparison, and the schools with black students comparison. An educational level comparison (grouping grade schools, junior high schools and high schools separately) of the four aspects was calculated as well.

In general, Piaget's conception of the adolescent as growing increasingly concerned with larger groups and groups more distant in status appears confirmed by the data. The comparisons also show that in regard to each of our indicators of Piaget's concept of "Decentering" (Distance, Group Size, Relative Status and Personification) the less mature tendency was supplemented rather than supplanted by the more mature mode of thinking.

CITIZENSHIP OBJECTIVES

The objectives for citizenship education in the 1970's grew from the data of the research project and the Center's basic conceptions of democracy and participation. The ten objectives outlined here aim to develop citizens

who are competent in the complexity of democratic decision-making both in his school and in the larger society. Democratic decision-making is seen as the key to civic competency. Crucial elements in democratic decision-making are the abilities to identify viable democratic alternatives and to analyze the options available or to create options if none exists. The democratic decision-maker must also be able to look at any situation from the viewpoints and problems of others as well as be able to consider group factors, institutional implications of a decision and the relevant democratic principles involved.

The objectives are formulated in terms of citizen behaviors and are summarized with relevant data from the overall survey. The juxtaposition of the two reveal the disharmony between the goals and means of civics education today and provide the perspectives that we think must be adopted by those that develop new curricular and institutional forms.

Objective One: THE CITIZEN PARTICIPATES IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS OF HIS SOCIETY.

The data show that high school students rarely participate in the resolution of conflicts to which they are participants. Less than 1/5 of the students reported having any say in the resolution of his problem. Resolution processes which would involve student participation are not operative in the overwhelming number of cases. The great majority of students also expressed dissatisfaction with the outcome of their conflicts. Students demonstrate a lack of ability to deal with democratic problems effectively; they also complain about the lack of ability to deal with democratic problems effectively; they also complain about the lack of democratic realities in their lives. We conclude that only a truly participative system of decision making within the school itself will help students develop both the skills of democratic decision-making and the consequent faith that it can be successful.

Objective Two: THE CITIZEN MAKES USE OF ALTERNATIVE COURSES OF ACTION. IF HE FINDS NO VIABLE OPTIONS OPEN, HE CREATES NEW ALTERNATIVES FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION.

The existence and use of meaningful alternatives for action is essential to a democratic society. Students of all levels and in all types of schools expressed no alternatives to the course of action in almost 3/4 of all reported incidents. Present civic education is not developing citizens who see and use democratic processes to obtain their goals.

Objective Three: THE CITIZEN ANALYZES COURSES OF ACTION FOR THEIR DEMOCRATIC BASES, FEASIBILITY, AND ANTICIPATED AND ACTUAL CONSEQUENCES.

Although few students were even able to identify alternative courses of action, the process of analysis of alternatives will still have to be learned in order to be an effective citizen. This process includes asking what is the democratic basis for each alternative, the feasibility of each alternative and the anticipated consequences of each type of action.

Objective Four: THE CITIZEN EMPLOYS NEGOTIATION, MEDIATION, AND ARBITRATION IN RESOLVING CONFLICTS.

The effective use of negotiation and mediation are essential democratic means for resolving problems. However, in the majority of student reported incidents, conflicts were solved by a unilateral decision by an authority. The reported incidents involved neither student participation at the basic level or decision-making or at the level of conflict resolution.

Objective Five: THE CITIZEN UNDERSTANDS AND ANALYZES ISSUES FROM VIEWPOINTS OTHER THAN HIS OWN.

Democratic problem-solving requires the ability to understand the viewpoints of one's adversaries. The data suggest that secondary school students largely lack this ability. Not only did the overwhelming majority fail to perceive alternatives, but also the techniques attempted in the alternate

questionnaire forms (specifically to elicit alternative views) failed to produce rounded viewpoints.

Objective Six: THE CITIZEN SEES DEMOCRATIC ISSUES IN PROBLEMS OF OTHERS, AS WELL AS IN HIS OWN LIFE.

Concern for the rights of others is a basic element of participation. The democratic citizen must be concerned with democracy as it functions in the lives of others. The protocols indicate that democratic concerns of the students are largely concerned with themselves rather than others.

Objective Seven: THE CITIZEN RECOGNIZES THE VALUE AND UTILIZES THE POWER OF GROUP ACTION.

In our society, the formation of groups and organizations is the traditional means of mobilizing power to effect social policy. Readings of the protocols reveal that students do not grasp the power of group action although half the protagonists are groups rather than individuals.

Objective Eight: THE CITIZEN DISTINGUISHES PERSONAL ISSUES AND CONFLICTS FROM INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES AND CONFLICTS, AND ATTACKS THE TWO ACCORDINGLY.

The data show that students see the majority of conflicts as occurring with persons or groups rather than with institutions. However, the great percentage of issues concern school governance. The students largely perceive these issues in personal rather than in institutional terms thereby diminishing their ability to resolve immediate conflicts or effect long-term change.

Objective Nine: THE CITIZEN GRASPS AND ACTS ON THE PRINCIPLES INVOLVED

Democratic decision-making requires the ability to conceptualize the problem and to act on principles rather than on feelings or personal desires.

The evidence gathered in our study leads to the conclusion that students are not abstracting their concrete problems above a personal level.

Objective Ten: THE CITIZEN RELATES HIS PRINCIPLES TO RELEVANT INCIDENTS.

Democratic action requires both principles and concrete experiences. Some students appeared bothered by abstract problems without being able to perceive them concretely (Reverse of Objective Four). One seventh of the protocols talked about abstract problems without mentioning specific incidents. In teaching civics, values and beliefs must be joined with concrete daily experiences in democracy if a citizenry capable of democratic action is to be developed.

DEVELOPMENTAL GUIDELINES

As shown by the analysis of the psychological process codes in light of Piaget's "Decentering" concept, there appear to exist stages or degrees of civic development in children. The objectives just specified, defined goals for civic education. The developmental guidelines indicate the present level of interviewed students in relation to those goals. They describe the degree of civic mindedness of junior and senior high school students for educators and are not to be seen as goals but as developmental stages of civic competence. Understanding of such stages should serve to identify the most useful points to begin teaching civic awareness to students.

Guideline One: JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' PROBLEMS ARE FOCUSED MORE ON THE STUDENTS THEMSELVES THAN ARE THOSE OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.

Junior high students for the most part write about personal problems. Conflicts are seen as conflicts with individuals. The developmental trend toward increasing involvement with non-personal problems has been identified in all comparisons.

Guideline Two: SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ARE MORE CONCERNED WITH GROUP PROBLEMS THAN JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS, AND THE LATTER ARE MORE INVOLVED WITH THE CONFLICTS OF INDIVIDUALS.

The four junior-senior high school comparisons show decisively that the group factor increases from junior to senior high school. Involvement with group problems definitely increase with age.

Guideline Three: JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS HAVE MORE CONFLICTS WITH THEIR PEERS THAN DO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, WHILE THE LATTER REPORT MORE CONFLICTS WITH AUTHORITY FIGURES THAN DO THE FORMER.

The cross-sectional comparisons show that without exception incidents involving peers decrease with age and incidents concerning authorities increase with age.

Guideline Four: PROBLEMS WITH INSTITUTIONS OCCUR MUCH MORE FREQUENTLY IN THE SENIOR THAN IN THE JUNIOR HIGH, WHILE PROBLEMS WITH PERSONS ARE MORE COMMON IN THE LATTER THAN IN THE FORMER.

Except in the school for gifted girls, all comparisons showed that high school students reported a greater percentage of institutional conflicts than junior high students. Junior high school students reported a greater share of problems with "persons." The school for gifted girls showed no difference between the percentage of personal incidents described by junior and senior high students.

Guideline Five: HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS HAVE A MORE HIGHLY DEVELOPED ABSTRACTIVE CAPACITY THAN THEIR JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS.

The preceding four guidelines all distinguish junior and senior high school students on the basis of an abstractive faculty, i.e. a capability for extending one's field of action from personal and immediate to more impersonal and distant concerns. Depersonalization is the process that differentiates junior and senior high students on each dimension of civic mindedness. The ability to extend oneself beyond the personal element and the immediate situation is the key to development from the first (junior high level) to the second (senior high level) stages of civic mindedness.

CONCLUSION

As noted in the summaries introduction, we believe the principal findings of the survey and the resulting objectives and guidelines for civics education raise important questions for those concerned with curricular and institutional reform.*

First, the content of civics courses should not consist of abstract problems and principles that have no bearing on a student's life in school. Our study shows that students perceive their problems in democracy in the concrete situations of their school and community life. If civics education aims to create competent citizens now and in the future, the curriculum should focus on these concrete situations. The teaching of facts and principles should be taught as a function of these concrete student interests. Teachers and curriculum planners must therefore be aware of the developmental stages of civic-mindedness and gear materials and methods accordingly.

Second the study points to a new conception of public secondary schools. The traditional teacher-student relationship must change. Because we have identified the development of decision-making ability as the most pressing need of contemporary civic education, students must be given the opportunity to make decisions within the classroom. The teacher must spend time as a resource person assisting the student in seeing and analyzing the options and relevant considerations involved in his civic problems. Rather than teaching a specified body of material, the teacher should aim to develop mature, autonomous civic decision-makers.

---

*It must be remembered that the separation between curricular and institutional reform is only a separation of convenience. In actuality, we see the course curriculum and content as unseparable from the structure and governance of the schools.

Likewise, the traditional administration-student relationship must change. In an environment where unilateral decision-making by authorities resolves the majority of problems in democracy, it is hard to see how students will develop in school the skills in democratic decision-making necessary for effective, participative citizenship. Only when students are involved in making policies and decisions of real concern to them will they develop these skills.

A civic education based on these concepts must make a far-reaching commitment to a new conception of high school. The school itself must become a civic community in which all the diverse groups within it take part in effective policies and decisions, and learn to become effective civic actors as they do so. So conceived the school more closely reflects the nature of the community within which it resides, and plays a more effective role in educating citizens who can act to improve the community itself.

APPENDIX A

Interview Form*

Sometimes a group has trouble being as democratic as its members would like it to be. Sometimes a person is not sure what is the democratic thing to do. Other times it seems as if no one can change the way things are enough to make a democracy work in a place like a school or a town. When someone wants to do new things or do things in a new way, it can start a fuss. Please write about one time when something like this happened to you or you saw something like this happen in your group or your school.

Please reread what you wrote and check that you have put in something about each topic below. As you find each item, check it off in the space below. Please add to your sotry any items you do not already have in it.

Where it happened	( )
Who started it	( )
Who else was there	( )
What problems came up	( )
How were the problems handled	( )
How else could the problems have been handled	( )

Now: we would like to know which of our names for problems in democratic behavior fits your story best. Please put number one (1) next to the name that fits best, number two (2) next to the name that fits second best, and so on.

Your story raised problems of:

Dissent	Criticizing, protesting, or refusing to take part in a group	( )
Equality	Getting the same chances in life no matter what your race, religion, sex, or how well off your parents are.	( )
Decision-making	Having a voice in what rules should be made and how they should be enforced	( )
Due process	Giving a person who has been accused of something a fair chance to defend himself	( )

---

*For the sake of brevity, the questionnaire form has been condensed. Students were given ample space to describe their incidents. The form was also translated in French and Spanish for non-English speaking students.